

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,335	02/06/2004	Robert Donovan	PTG 02-83-5	5268
28268 THE BLACK &	28268 7590 04/24/2007 THE BLACK & DECKER CORPORATIO 701 EAST JOPPA ROAD, TW199 TOWSON, MD 21286		EXAMINER	
701 EAST JOP			BLAKE, CAROLYN T	
TOWSON, ML		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3724	
	,		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
	•		04/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
10/774,335		DONOVAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Carolyn T. Blake	3724	

	Carolyn T. Blake	3724	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>13 November 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	ice, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) \square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.	•	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	pliance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	filed within two month	ns of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	ecause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below			
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or			the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	jected claims:	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		tion also file of a managed and	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).	·	,	•
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		III be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: <i>4-10,14-21 and 28-35.</i>		·	
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3,11-13,22,25-27,36 and 39</u> .		•	•
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>23,24,37,38 and</u>	<u>43-45</u> .		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	All of the second of the secon		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attacl	ned.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
13. Other:		} /~	
	7	WED B. A	
	OUD TO	OYER D. ASHLEY	

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The limitation to the independent claims requiring "a cam assembly... applying a force to the tension spring assembly" requires further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

Applicant argues the Lee reference does not teach "a cam assembly operationally engaging with the tension spring assembly, the cam assembly applying a force to the tension spring" as set forth in the independent claims. This is incorrect. Since the Lee spring is a tension spring, it urges the related components, including the cam, in a direction. Newton's third law of motion states that for every action, there is an equal and opposite reaction. As such, the cam also applies a force to the spring.

In addition, Applicant argues the Lee reference does not teach a cover assembly as claimed. Again, this is incorrect. The cover and handle of Lee are separate components from the cam. As such, they can "selectively engage" as claimed.

While the Lee components and forces may be different than Applicant's, these differences have not been set forth in at least the independent claims.